

Date: Tue, 18 May 93 11:06:33 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #150
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Tue, 18 May 93 Volume 93 : Issue 150

Today's Topics:

 11m vs Hams (was No-Code Stupidity) (4 msgs)
 More on no-code
 Morse et cetera... (3 msgs)
 No-Code Stupidity

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Tue, 18 May 93 15:58:04 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!
nnntp.Stanford.EDU!umunhum!paulf@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: 11m vs Hams (was No-Code Stupidity)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993May18.081356.8528@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com> little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com
(nuts2u::little) writes:

>As someone else suggested, why not get the FCC records on NALs and see what
>the percentage of each class of license has been issued NALs.

Just remember to normalize for total operating time. Not all NALs are for
deliberate misfeasance.

--

-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The National Anthem has become The Whine."
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Charles Sykes, _A Nation of Victims_

Date: Tue, 18 May 1993 16:58:39 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!news.ucdavis.edu!othello.ucdavis.edu!
ez006683@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: 11m vs Hams (was No-Code Stupidity)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

paulf@umunhum.stanford.edu (Paul Flaherty) writes:
: In article <1993May18.081356.8528@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com> little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com
(nuts2u::little) writes:
: >As someone else suggested, why not get the FCC records on NALs and see what
: >the percentage of each class of license has been issued NALs.
:
: Just remember to normalize for total operating time. Not all NALs are for
: deliberate misfeasance.

Please enlighten us Paul, what percentage of NAL's are issued for
accidental infractions? What difference does it make anyway. If an
amateur is radiating excess spurious signals, for example, isn't s/he just
as guilty. They should be able to control the output of their stations,
that is their responsibility.

Dan

--

```
*-----*
* Daniel D. Todd      Packet: KC6UUD@WA6RDH.#nocal.ca.usa      *
*                      Internet: DDTODD@ucdavis.edu             *
*                      Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102            *
*                      Davis CA 95616                          *
*-----*
*      I do not speak for the University of California....    *
*      and it sure as hell doesn't speak for me!!            *
*-----*
```

Date: Tue, 18 May 1993 16:52:40 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!news.ucdavis.edu!othello.ucdavis.edu!
ez006683@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: 11m vs Hams (was No-Code Stupidity)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

r_fussel@oz.plymouth.edu (Ronald D. Fussell) writes:

[Todd's stuff deleted]

: Well, I'm sure you're a seasoned pro at this, and you've "seen it
: all", but if you are trying to tell me that the INTENTIONAL name

: calling, overpowering, and overall rudeness on the HF bands are equal
Just out of curiosity what is non-intentional anme calling?

: to 11 meters, you've got to be kidding me. I was a CBer for a while
: before I got my ticket, so I can say that I've seen both ends of the
: spectrum. In 11 meters, I've witnessed people keying up intentionally
: to prevent others from using that channel. I heard challenges to

It's nice to see that YOU have seen it all!

: fights. I've seen "fox hunts" where CBers try to locate somebodys signal,
: and stick pins in their coax. Never once have I seen that such actions
: the HF bands. Sure there's the occiasional pileup, and people can be
You've NEVER seen such activity on HF? Well I guess you haven't sen it all.

: jerks, but nothing like 11 meters. I'm sorry, but I don't buy it.
:
: >>Let's face it, there's a little bit of a difference between talking to
: >>your buddy accross the street, and working a rare staition in some
: >>obscure part of the world. Please reconsider your argument.
: >
: >For me there is a difference because I like to chase DX. To a non-DXer
: >they're the same. Certainly neither one is more important than the
: >other. Each one to their own.
:
: Well Todd, once again, you missed the point. What you're saying is
: that to a non-DXer, the distance factor is the same. Then for a non
: DXer, it's O.K. to use 1k watts to talk to his friend across the
: street. I'm SURE the FCC would approve of that.

When was the last time an NAL was handed out for using more than the
minimum power required, but within the maximum legal levels? I am just
wondering, this is not a flame or argumentative point just curiosity.

:
: Have a nice day!
You too!

Dan

--

```
*-----*
* Daniel D. Todd      Packet: KC6UUD@WA6RDH.#nocal.ca.usa      *
*                    Internet: DDTODD@ucdavis.edu              *
*                    Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102              *
*                    Davis CA 95616                            *
*-----*
*      I do not speak for the University of California....    *
*      and it sure as hell doesn't speak for me!!            *
```

Date: Tue, 18 May 93 17:12:20 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!oz.plymouth.edu!
r_fussel@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: 11m vs Hams (was No-Code Stupidity)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993May18.081356.8528@nnntp2.cxo.dec.com> little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com
(nuts2u::little) writes:

>>spectrum. In 11 meters, I've witnessed people keying up intentionally
>>to prevent others from using that channel. I heard challenges to
>>fights. I've seen "fox hunts" where CBers try to locate somebodys signal,
>>and stick pins in their coax. Never once have I seen that such actions
>>the HF bands. Sure there's the occasional pileup, and people can be
>
>You've never seen someone key up on the HF bands to prevent others from
>using that frequency? What bands do you operate on? In 8 months of
>operating on the HF bands I've heard it plenty of times. Wonderful thing
>about anecdotal evidence, your's may be different than mine. ;-)

Yes, I've seen people key up on the bands to "walk over" other
peoples signals, but whether or not it was intentional, I cannot say.
I'm sure I've accidentally walked over a few stations, but I've never
done anything intentionally. Besides, just because you can hear
somebody, that doesn't mean that they can hear you. You also forgot to
mention some of my other examples, such as the fox hunts.

>> Well Todd, once again, you missed the point. What you're saying is
>>that to a non-DXer, the distance factor is the same. Then for a non
>>DXer, it's O.K. to use 1k watts to talk to his friend across the
>>street. I'm SURE the FCC would approve of that.
>
>Excuse me, what point did I miss? The point was never about power, the
>point was about rude and obnoxious behavior. I used an example of a CBer
>keying up his linear to obliterate a nearby conversation. But since that
>never happens on the amateur bands according to you, I chose the equally
>obnoxious behaviors that certain Morsely impaired individuals in the
>amateur ranks demonstrate on a regular basis. It's pretty clear that the
>CBers don't have a lock on obnoxious behavior. And it's equally as clear
>that the Morse code requirement doesn't filter out obnoxious arrogant
>operators as some in this thread would like to imply.
>

>As someone else suggested, why not get the FCC records on NALs and see what
>the percentage of each class of license has been issued NALs. Based upon
>what I've seen written up in QST over the last year or two, novices and
>technicians which make up over half the amateur population account for far
>less than half the NALs issued to licensed amateurs.

Your NAL argument would be valid if we were talking about comparisons of licencees with different licences. We are no longer talking about that, nor are we talking about code. I agree that someone that can copy code at 20wpm is no less likely to cause havoc than one who copies at 5wpm. I don't agree with your argument about the difference between 11m and the rest of HF. We need to clear some things up here. I need to know EXACTLY what your premise. Based on your last three posts, I can only assume that your argument is that the attitudes of hams are equal to CBers.

A more accurate argument would be to compare the NALs for hams, and the reprimands given to CBers. Unfortunately, this is impossible seeing that a lot happens on CB that the FCC doesn't even hear. Todd, I still don't buy your argument. Please keep in mind that this is no longer a discussion about code :).

Have a super day!

Ron
N1HIB

FLAMES ARE WELCOME

Date: Tue, 18 May 93 16:16:33 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!
nnntp.Stanford.EDU!umunhum!paulf@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: More on no-code
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <C76uF0.70@ucdavis.edu> ez006683@othello.ucdavis.edu (Daniel D. Todd) writes:

>Perhaps I am confused here. Part 97 strongly implies that there is a
>distinct advantage to having more rather than less amateurs in the US.
>And the Comms. Act of 1934 says that it is the FCC's duty to limit the
>number of stations on the air. Well I suppose it comes down to which
>document you want to put more emphasis on.

Close. The interference limit puts a cap on the number of stations you can pack in to an allocation. But you do want to be at least reasonably close to that limit (we're nowhere near it in the VHF/UHF allocations) in order to extend the benefits of the service. There is a third dimension as

well, increasing the service allocations, but that doesn't happen very often at HF, especially given the demand by other services with higher priority.

>Please explain this. I've heard this same point before but it never did
>make any sense to me. I personally have a certain amount of information
>I want to transfer. If I want to talk about the fact that my girlfriends
>softball team just earned a berth in the Div II National Tournament then
>I'm gonna do it whether I'm on ssb, fm, packet, cw or the internet :-)

Most hams have a limited amount of time to spend on the air (a few hours between chores, etc.). If that time is shorter, the amount of subjects discussed will be reduced. As the time to operate is lengthened, either more subjects are discussed, or more QSOs are had. This is true whether one is keeping a sked, chewing the rag, chasing DX, contesting, etc. Remember, our conversations, by their nature, are supposed to be casual.

--

-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The National Anthem has become The Whine."
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Charles Sykes, _A Nation of Victims_

Date: Tue, 18 May 93 06:44:17 CDT
From: usc!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!menudo.uh.edu!jpunix!unkaphaed!amanda!
robert@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Morse et cetera...
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

> In article <1993May17.214135.850@leland.Stanford.EDU>
> paulf@calvin.stanford.edu (Paul Flaherty) writes:
> >In article <1t8kjq\$lvu@chnews.intel.com>
> jrbromley@joshua.intel.com (James Bromley~) writes:
>
> >>Robert, Dan's class of license (or that he even has one) is immaterial
> >>to the discussion. And the issue isn't fairness of the current licensing
> >>scheme, it is the relevance of it to present-day and future amateur
> >>radio service requirements. Please address the matter at hand and
> >>refrain from these thinly disguised, ad hominem attacks.
>
> >Well, it becomes material and relevant when Dan makes it relevant, to wit:
>
> >---BEGIN INCLUDED TEXT---
> >
> >Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> >From: ez006683@othello.ucdavis.edu (Daniel D. Todd)
> >Subject: Re: More on no-code

> >Message-ID: <C6xM3H.9z8@ucdavis.edu>
> >Date: Wed, 12 May 1993 20:54:52 GMT
> >
> >.
> >It must really kill you that I'm part of the same favored group as you.
> >Or that there are also extras who want to see the code requirement changed.
> >.
> >--END INCLUDED TEXT--
> >
> >Looks like a ringing contradiction to me.
> >
> >--Paul Flaherty, N9FZX
>
>

All Extras don't think alike, nor do they share the same views.
As Gomer Pyle would say, "Surprise, surprise!"

--Robert

Date: Tue, 18 May 1993 16:34:17 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!agate!news.ucdavis.edu!
othello.ucdavis.edu!ez006683@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Morse et cetera...
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

paulf@calvin.stanford.edu (Paul Flaherty) writes:
: In article <1t8kjq\$lvu@chnews.intel.com> jlbromley@joshua.intel.com (James
: Bromley~) writes:
: >Robert, Dan's class of license (or that he even has one) is immaterial
: >to the discussion. And the issue isn't fairness of the current licensing
: >scheme, it is the relevance of it to present-day and future amateur
: >radio service requirements. Please address the matter at hand and
: >refrain from these thinly disguised, ad hominem attacks.
:
: Well, it becomes material and relevant when Dan makes it relevant, to wit:
:
: .
: It must really kill you that I'm part of the same favored group as you.
: Or that there are also extras who want to see the code requirement changed.
: .
I'm sorry if you were unable to decipher my writing. favored group =
amateur radio. I am not one. the other sentence was a reference to
others who are extra class and would like to see changes. NO contradiction
no ringing no relevance.

: Looks like a ringing contradiction to me.
:

Dan

--

```
*-----*
* Daniel D. Todd      Packet: KC6UUD@WA6RDH.#nocal.ca.usa      *
*                    Internet: DDTODD@ucdavis.edu              *
*                    Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102              *
*                    Davis CA 95616                            *
*-----*
*      I do not speak for the University of California....    *
*      and it sure as hell doesn't speak for me!!            *
*-----*
```

Date: Tue, 18 May 1993 16:30:29 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!news.ucdavis.edu!othello.ucdavis.edu!
ez006683@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Morse et cetera...
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert) writes:

:

: Your license class makes a big difference, Dan. If you are an Extra, then
: your argument has credibility. If you are a Technician, then in the eyes
: of the group you are whining. I'm sorry, Dan, but I just don't buy it.
: I'll make a wager with you. Upgrade through the amateur ranks to Extra.
: It's not difficult, but be advised that it does take effort. When you
: have accomplished that, let me know what your opinion on the subject at
: hand is. I predict either one of two things will occur: you will upgrade,
: and your opinion will change, or you will never upgrade, and continue
: to whine.

:

: Have a nice day.

:

: --Robert

I'm sorry but my license class makes absolutely no difference. I don't seem to recall any license class limitation for PRB employees at the FCC or in congress where laws effecting hams are passed. Please remember that just because someone isn't of a certain class they aren't automatically less intelligent or that their opinion is of less value. I would suggest that if your opinion has changed based soley on your license class you are the person who needs to be concerned upon what your values are based upon not me.

Dan

--

```
*-----*
* Daniel D. Todd      Packet: KC6UUD@WA6RDH.#nocal.ca.usa      *
*                      Internet: DDTODD@ucdavis.edu              *
*                      Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102             *
*                      Davis CA 95616                           *
*-----*
*      I do not speak for the University of California....    *
*      and it sure as hell doesn't speak for me!!             *
*-----*
```

Date: Tue, 18 May 1993 10:52:00 GMT
From: anomaly.sbs.com!kd1hz@uunet.uu.net
Subject: No-Code Stupidity
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com (nuts2u::little) writes:

>In any case, what I've heard on CB sounds very similar to what I hear on
>several amateur HF bands from stations with valid licenses. Or is all the
>garbage on 20 and 75 meters coming from bootleggers?

The "garbage" on 20/75 meters is relatively limited to a handful of stations.
Why amateurs in the hobby put up with it - who knows. However, you certainly
can't depend on the FCC to fix the problem.

>How does the behavior
>of DXers when the bands are in poor shape or contesters on contest weekends
>differ from the CBers turning on their linear to walk over nearby
>conversations?

Just because YOU can hear a station doesn't mean that IT can hear you.
I've routinely been "stepped on" by stations who didn't know I was there,
and I'm sure I've stepped on stations which I couldn't hear. An
unfortunate consequence of the bands being crowded.

>As you said, get a life (before you fall off your pedestal or pass out due
>to lack of oxygen.)

Yep, folks, the mandatory laughable-personal-attack. You can definitely tell
you're winning the argument when these puerile attacks become a regular part
of the posting... Of course, from this poster, should we expect any less?

MD

--

-- Michael P. Daignan, KD1HZ	/	Since I *OWN* SBS.COM,
-- Domain: kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.risc.net	/	these opinions generally
-- UUCP: ...!uunet!anomaly!kd1hz	/	reflect those of my
-- Telebit: +1 401 455 0347	/	company...

Date: Tue, 18 May 1993 14:22:52 GMT

From: swrinde!emory!news-feed-1.peachnet.edu!gatech!kd4nc!ke4zv!

gary@network.UCSD.EDU

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993May17.195817.11106@oz.plymouth.edu> ,

<1993May17.214208.22929@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com> ,

<1993May17.230005.27469@oz.plymouth.edu>=

Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)

Subject : Re: No-Code Stupidity

In article <1993May17.230005.27469@oz.plymouth.edu> r_fussel@oz.plymouth.edu

(Ronald D. Fussell) writes:

>In article <1993May17.214208.22929@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com> little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com

(nuts2u::little) writes:

>

>[parts of a pointless rebuttal deleted]

>

>>garbage on 20 and 75 meters coming from bootleggers? How does the behavior
>>of DXers when the bands are in poor shape or testers on contest weekends
>>differ from the CBers turning on their linear to walk over nearby
>>conversations? Or is the same behavior acceptable on the amateur bands
>>because those stations are "licensed" and legal while the CBers aren't.

This is an excellent and telling point. The rude and bullying behavior of certain amateurs is indistinguishable from that of certain CBers.

> Well, that one is easy, CBers crank their linears and walk over the
>other stations to piss people off. Generally, this is considered rude
>and offensive. On the other hand, when the bands are in poor shape,
>or when a contest is taking place, the extra power is needed to get
>the job done. Of course there are the unfortunate who are limited
>with their equipment, but that's their problem. I don't have a
>linear, and I only run 100 watts, tops. You don't hear me complaining.
>Let's face it, there's a little bit of a difference between talking to
>your buddy accross the street, and working a rare station in some
>obscure part of the world. Please reconsider your argument.

Indeed there is a difference between conversing with a friend, or making a new friend, and screaming meaningless numbers at some poor foreigner just because he happens to live in a different part of the world. At least in the former case *some* actual communications may occur while in the latter only the noise level is raised.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: 18 May 93 14:18:13 GMT
From: furuta@MIMSY.CS.UMD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993May17.195817.11106@oz.plymouth.edu>,
<1993May17.214208.22929@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com>,
<1993May17.230005.27469@oz.plymouth.edu>,
Subject : Hams and Usenet [was Re: No-Code Stupidity]

In article <1993May17.230005.27469@oz.plymouth.edu> r_fussel@oz.plymouth.edu (Ronald D. Fussell) writes:

[Deleted. The topic is whether or not the transmissions on parts of the Amateur HF spectrum resemble the 11 meters CB]

> Please reconsider your argument.

Hey, I've got it now. It's not HF that's like CB, it's Usenet! :-)

Actually I have been struck by some of the gaps in the knowledge of the Usenet environment displayed even by those who flame at others while wearing a mantle of computer guru superiority. What kind of gaps? Well lack of knowledge of net culture, for example etiquette, and history, lack of knowledge about transport mechanisms and their side effects [e.g., why did the ... character in an earlier post become ... at some sites? Hint, it wasn't done maliciously or even manually.], etc.

Perhaps what we need to do is to set up an incentive licensing scheme that would grant Usenet posting privledges. Novices could post with a world-wide distribution but only to selected newsgroups. No-Code Technicians would have have complete privledges in regional areas (how about RI?), but could only use limited distributions, and so forth.

Then we could flame about how letting all these untrained people onto Usenet has made it far worse than the good old days and how our fathers, who read Arpanet mailing lists in the 1970's say that today's Usenet sounds like a bunch of CB-ers (or I suppose I could throw in a gratuitous dig and say "a bunch of BBS-ers").

--Rick

Date: Tue, 18 May 1993 13:12:51 GMT
From: usc!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!darwin.sura.net!rsg1.er.usgs.gov!
resdgs1.er.usgs.gov!tbodoh@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993May17.195817.11106@oz.plymouth.edu>,
<1993May17.214208.22929@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com>,
<1993May18.105200.10880@anomaly.sbs.com>
Subject : Re: No-Code Stupidity

In article <1993May18.105200.10880@anomaly.sbs.com>, kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.com (Rev. Michael P. Deignan) writes:

|>
|> >As you said, get a life (before you fall off your pedestal or pass out due
|> >to lack of oxygen.)
|>
|> Yep, folks, the mandatory laughable-personal-attack. You can definitely tell
|> you're winning the argument when these puerile attacks become a regular part
|> of the posting... Of course, from this poster, should we expect any less?
|>
|> MD
|> --
> -- Michael P. Deignan, KD1HZ / Since I *OWN* SBS.COM,

You can win a debate and you can sway a discussion but you can't "win" an argument because the very word implies strong emotions. (ME)

You don't really believe that you're somehow going to convince the no-coders to see it your way, do you? About as likely as you offering a no-code technician seminar!

You do have some good arguments, but your abrasive attitude and insulting comments lead people to disregard what you say. Although there is no winning in this or any argument, how about EVERYONE toning down their insults - maybe a constructive discussion might erupt!

+++++

+ Tom Bodoh - Sr. systems software engineer
+
+ USGS/EROS Data Center, Sioux Falls, SD, USA 57198 (605) 594-6830 +
+ Internet; bodoh@dggs.cr.usgs.gov (152.61.192.66)
+
+ "Welcome back my friends to the show that never ends!" EL&P
+
+++++

Date: Tue, 18 May 93 17:18:22 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!oz.plymouth.edu!
r_fussel@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993May17.214208.22929@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com>,
<1993May17.230005.27469@oz.plymouth.edu>, <67711@mimsy.umd.edu>
Subject : Re: Hams and Usenet [was Re: No-Code Stupidity]

In article <67711@mimsy.umd.edu> furuta@cs.umd.edu (Richard Furuta) writes:

[a GREAT idea deleted]
>Perhaps what we need to do is to set up an incentive licensing scheme that
>would grant Usenet posting privldges. Novices could post with a world-wide
>distribution but only to selected newsgroups. No-Code Technicians would
>have have complete privldges in regional areas (how about RI?), but could
>only use limited distributions, and so forth.
>
>Then we could flame about how letting all these untrained people onto Usenet
>has made it far worse than the good old days and how our fathers, who read
>Arpanet mailing lists in the 1970's say that today's Usenet sounds like a
>bunch of CB-ers (or I suppose I could thrown in a gratuitous dig and say "a
>bunch of BBS-ers").
>
>
--Rick

Hey rick, that's a GREAT idea. All you have to do now is decide if
you need to pass a code exam to get your privs! This is not a series
of falmes, as you have implied, just a series of disscussions. That's
all. If it was more like 11 meters, like you have said, then I would
be calling everyone else rude and slandourous names. I would also be
posting 10000 line posts that mean nothing, for the sheer purpose of
wasting bandwith.

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #150
